

Original citation:

Francis, L. and Village, A. (2012). The psychological temperament of Anglican clergy in Ordained Local Ministry (OLM) : the conserving, serving pastor? Journal of Empirical Theology, 25(1), pp. 57-76

Permanent WRAP url:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/49377/>

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes the work of researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

A note on versions:

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP url' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk

warwick**publications**wrap

highlight your research

<http://go.warwick.ac.uk/lib-publications>

The psychological temperament of Anglican clergy in ordained local ministry (OLM): the
conserving, serving pastor?

Leslie J Francis *

University of Warwick, UK

Andrew Village

York St John University, UK

Author note:

*Corresponding author:

Leslie J Francis

Warwick Religions & Education Research Unit

Institute of Education

The University of Warwick

Coventry CV4 7AL United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)24 7652 2539

Fax: +44 (0)24 7657 2638

Email: leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk

Abstract

This study draws on psychological type theory as originally proposed by Jung (1971) and psychological temperament theory as proposed by Kiersey and Bates (1978) to explore the hypothesis that ordained local ministers (OLMs) within the Church of England reflect a psychological profile more in keeping with the profile of Church of England congregations than with the profile of established professional mobile clergy serving in the Church of England. Data provided by 135 individuals recently ordained as OLMs (79 women and 56 men) supported the hypothesis. Compared with established professional mobile clergy there is a higher proportion of the Epimethean Temperament (SJ) among OLMs. Oswald and Kroeger (1988) characterise SJ religious leaders as ‘the conserving, serving pastor’. The implications of these findings are discussed for the evolving ministry of the Church of England.

Keywords: psychology, religion, clergy, psychological type, ordained local ministry.

Introduction

The introduction and development of ordained local ministry in the Church of England has been both innovative and divisive (see Jones, Village, & Francis, in press). It is innovative in the sense that the onus of vocation has been placed on the call by the local church, the tasks of theological education and priestly formation have been rooted in the local community, and the exercise of ordained ministry has been limited by licence to the local church and generally within the context of an authorised and recognised ministry team. It is divisive in the sense that around half of the dioceses of the Church of England have shared in this experiment and the other half have not done so. Indeed, some dioceses that pioneered the experiment have subsequently withdrawn from it.

The pioneers of ordained local ministry, like Ted Roberts (1972, 2006), have argued that this form of ministry has the potential to recruit a very different kind of priest who is rooted in the local congregation, grounded in the local community, and capable of proclaiming the gospel in contexts less accessible to the seminary trained, stipendiary and mobile professional clergy. If these claims are reflected in practice, it is reasonable to hypothesise that there are empirically discernable differences between clergy serving within ordained local ministry and clergy serving within traditional forms of parish ministry.

One theoretical framework within which this empirical question can be addressed is that provided by psychological type theory. Psychological type theory has its roots in the pioneering work of Carl Jung (1971) and in the developments shaped by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985) and the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey & Bates, 1978). Since the 1980s there has been an established tradition of empirical research employing psychological type theory among religious professionals in the USA, reported in studies like Greenfield (1969), Harbaugh (1984), Holsworth (1984), Cabral (1984), Macdaid, McCaulley and Kainz (1986), and Bigelow, Fitzgerald, Busk, Girault, and Avis (1988). More

recently this tradition has flourished in the UK, including studies among Presbyterian Church of Scotland ministers (Irvine, 1989), Anglican clergymen serving in the Church in Wales (Francis, Payne, & Jones, 2001; Francis & Payne, 2002, Francis, Littler, & Robbins, 2010), male and female Bible College students (Francis, Penson, & Jones, 2001), evangelical church leaders (Francis & Robbins, 2002; Craig, Francis, & Robbins, 2004), male missionary personnel (Craig, Horsfall, & Francis, 2005), evangelical lay church leaders (Francis, Craig, Horsfall, & Ross, 2005), Roman Catholic priests (Craig, Duncan, & Francis, 2006), youth ministers (Francis, Nash, Nash, & Craig, 2007; Village, 2011), Anglican clergymen and clergywomen serving in the Church of England (Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007), evangelical Anglican seminarians (Francis, Craig, & Butler, 2007), Assemblies of God theological college students (Kay & Francis, 2008; Kay, Francis, & Craig, 2008), lead elders serving within the Newfrontiers network of churches (Francis, Gubb, & Robbins, 2009), Church of England hospital chaplains (Francis, Hancocks, Swift, & Robbins, 2009), Methodist Circuit ministers (Burton, Francis, Robbins, 2010, and male and female Free Church ministers in England (Francis, Whinney, Burton, & Robbins, 2011).

The basic building blocks of psychological type theory distinguish between two orientations (extraversion and introversion), two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition), two judging functions (thinking and feeling), and two attitudes toward the outer world (judging and perceiving).

The two orientations are concerned with where energy is drawn from; energy can be gathered either from the outside world or from the inner world. Extraverts (E) are orientated toward the outside world; they are energised by the events and people around them. They enjoy communicating and thrive in stimulating and exciting environments. They prefer to act in a situation rather than to reflect on it. They may vocalise a problem or an idea, rather than thinking it through privately. They may be bored and frustrated by silence and solitude. They

tend to focus their attention upon what is happening outside themselves and may be influenced by the opinions of other people. They are usually open individuals, easy to get to know, and enjoy having many friends. In contrast, introverts (I) are orientated toward their inner world; they are energised by their inner ideas and concepts. They may feel drained by events and people around them. They prefer to reflect on a situation rather than to act in it. They enjoy solitude, silence, and contemplation, as they tend to focus their attention upon what is happening in their inner life. They may appear reserved and detached as they are difficult to get to know, and they may prefer to have a small circle of intimate friends rather than many acquaintances.

The perceiving functions are concerned with the way in which people receive and process information; this can be done through use of the senses or through use of intuition. Sensing types (S) focus on the realities of a situation as perceived by the senses. They tend to focus on specific details, rather than the overall picture. They are concerned with the actual, the real, and the practical and tend to be down-to-earth and matter-of-fact. They may feel that particular details are more significant than general patterns. They are frequently fond of the traditional and conventional. They may be conservative and tend to prefer what is known and well-established. In contrast, intuitive types (N) focus on the possibilities of a situation, perceiving meanings and relationships. They may feel that perception by the senses is not as valuable as information gained from the unconscious mind; indirect associations and concepts impact their perceptions. They focus on the overall picture, rather than specific facts and data. They follow their inspirations enthusiastically, but not always realistically. They can appear to be up in the air and may be seen as idealistic dreamers. They often aspire to bring innovative change to established conventions.

The judging functions are concerned with the way in which people make decisions and judgements; this can be done through use of objective impersonal logic or subjective

interpersonal values. Thinking types (T) make judgements based on objective, impersonal logic. They value integrity and justice. They are known for their truthfulness and for their desire for fairness. They consider conforming to principles to be of more importance than cultivating harmony. They are often good at making difficult decisions as they are able to analyse problems in order to reach an unbiased and reasonable solution. They are frequently referred to as 'tough-minded'. They may consider it to be more important to be honest and correct than to be tactful, when working with others. In contrast, feeling types (F) make judgements based on subjective, personal values. They value compassion and mercy. They are known for their tactfulness and for their desire for peace. They are more concerned to promote harmony, than to adhere to abstract principles. They may be thought of as 'people-persons', as they are able to take into account other people's feelings and values in decision-making and problem-solving, ensuring they reach a solution that satisfies everyone. They are often thought of as 'warm-hearted'. They may find it difficult to criticise others, even when it is necessary. They find it easy to empathise with other people and tend to be trusting and encouraging of others.

The attitudes towards the outside world are concerning with the way in which people respond to the world around them, either by imposing structure and order on that world or remaining open and adaptable to the world around them. Judging types (J) have a planned, orderly approach to life. They enjoy routine and established patterns. They prefer to follow schedules in order to reach an established goal and may make use of lists, timetables, or diaries. They tend to be punctual, organised, and tidy. They may find it difficult to deal with unexpected disruptions of their plans. Likewise, they are inclined to be resistant to changes to established methods. They prefer to make decisions quickly and to stick to their conclusions once made. In contrast, perceiving types (P) have a flexible, open-ended approach to life. They enjoy change and spontaneity. They prefer to leave projects open in order to adapt and

improve them. They may find plans and schedules restrictive and tend to be easygoing about issues such as punctuality, deadlines, and tidiness. Indeed, they may consider last minute pressure to be a necessary motivation in order to complete projects. They are often good at dealing with the unexpected. Indeed, they may welcome change and variety as routine bores them. Their behaviour may often seem impulsive and unplanned.

Psychological type data can be reported and interpreted in a number of different ways, drawing on the four dichotomous type preferences (the two orientations, the two perceiving functions, the two judging functions, and the two attitudes), on the 16 complete types (like ISTJ or ENFP), on the four dominant types (dominant sensing, dominant intuition, dominant feeling, or dominant thinking) or on the eight dominant and auxiliary pairs (like dominant thinking with auxiliary intuition, or dominant intuition with auxiliary thinking). Keirsey and Bates (1978) proposed an interpretive framework drawing on and distinguishing between four temperaments characterised as SJ, SP, NT and NF.

In the language shaped by Keirsey and Bates (1978) the Epimethean Temperament characterises the SJ profile, people who long to be dutiful and exist primarily to be useful to the social units to which they belong. The Dionysian Temperament characterises the SP profile, people who want to be engaged, involved, and doing something new. The Promethean Temperament characterises the NT profile, people who want to understand, explain, shape and predict realities, and who prize their personal competence. The Apollonian Temperament characterises the NF profile, people who quest for authenticity and for self-actualisation, who are idealistic and who have great capacity for empathic listening. Oswald and Kroeger (1988) built on Keirsey and Bates' (1978) characterisation of the four temperaments to create profiles of how these four temperaments shape four very different styles of religious leadership.

The Epimethean Temperament (SJ) is styled 'the conserving, serving pastor'. SJ

clergy tend to be the most traditional of all clergy temperaments, bringing stability and continuity in whatever situation they are called to serve. They proclaim a single and straightforward faith, committed to down-to-earth rules for the Christian life. They serve as protectors and conservers of the traditions inherited from the past. If change is to take place, it emerges by evolution, not revolution. They excel at building community, fostering a sense of loyalty and belonging. They bring order and stability to their congregations, creating plans, developing procedures and formulating policies; and they are keen that these procedures should be followed. They can be trusted for their reliability, punctuality and efficiency. They are effective pastors, showing particular concern for the young, the elderly, and the weak. They are realists who offer practical and down-to-earth solutions to pastoral problems.

The Dionysian Temperament (SP) is styled 'the action-oriented pastor'. SP clergy tend to be the most fun loving of all clergy temperaments, possessing a compulsive need to be engaged in activity. They have little need for or interest in the abstract, the theoretical, and the non-practical aspects of theology and church life. They are flexible and spontaneous people who welcome the unplanned and unpredictable aspects of church life. They can bring the church to life with activities for everyone from cradle to grave. They have a flare for grasping the moment. They are entertainers and performers at heart. They are at their best in a crisis and are good at handling conflict resolution. They are fun loving and enjoy working with children and young people. They are better at starting new initiatives than at seeing things through. SP clergy may be particularly attracted to charismatic worship, responding to the leading of the Holy Spirit, welcoming a free-flowing form that allows for impromptu testimonials, speaking in tongues, and spontaneous singing.

The Promethean Temperament (NT) is styled 'the intellectual, competence-seeking pastor'. NT clergy are the most academically and intellectually grounded of all clergy temperaments, motivated by the search for meaning for truth and for possibilities. They are

visionaries who need to excel in all they do, and they tend to push their congregations to excel as well. They enjoy the academic study and analysis of the faith, and may try to run their church as an extension of the seminary. They make great teachers, preachers, and advocates for social justice. They look for underlying principles rather than basic applications from their study of scripture. They see the value of opposing views and strive to allow alternative visions to be heard. They are more concerned with finding truth than with engineering harmony and compromise. NT clergy need to be challenged in their ministry and to be able to move from one challenge to the next.

The Apollonian Temperament (NF) is styled ‘the authenticity-seeking, relationship-oriented pastor’. NF clergy tend to be the most idealistic and romantic of all clergy temperaments, attracted to helping roles that deal with human suffering. They want to meet the needs of others and to find personal affirmation in so doing. They can be articulate and inspiring communicators, committed to influencing others by touching their hearts. They have good empathic capacity, interpersonal skills, and pastoral counselling techniques. They find themselves listening to other people’s problems in the most unlikely contexts, and really caring about them. NF clergy tend to be high on inspiration, but lower on the practical down-to-earth aspects of ministry. They are able to draw the best out of people and work well as the catalyst or facilitator in the congregation as long as others are on hand to work with and to implement their vision. They are at their best when leading in people-related projects, such as starting a project for the elderly or for youth. They are most comfortable in unstructured meetings where they are good at facilitating group decision-making processes.

Four recent general samples of Church of England professional mobile clergy (two of clergymen and two of clergywomen), reported by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007), by Francis, Robbins, Duncan, and Whinney (2010) and by Francis, Robbins, and Whinney (2011), enable the relative prevalence of the four temperaments to be assessed.

These data, presented in table 1, demonstrate that the most frequently occurring

– insert table 1 about here –

psychological temperament among professional mobile clergy is the Apollonian Temperament (NF), especially among clergywomen, accounting for 35% and 39% of clergymen in the two studies, and 50% and 49% of clergywomen in the two studies. Among professional mobile clergy the Epimethean Temperament (SJ) is less prominent, accounting for between 27% and 33% across the four studies.

Alongside the established tradition of empirical research employing psychological type theory among religious professionals, a second, somewhat less developed, empirical research tradition has also employed psychological type theory among church congregations, including studies in the USA reported by Gerhardt (1983) and Rehak (1988), studies in Canada reported by Delis-Bulhoses (1990) and Ross (1993, 1995), studies in England reported by Francis, Duncan, Craig, and Luffman (2004), reported by Francis, Butler, Jones, and Craig (2007) and Francis, Robbins, and Craig (in press), studies in Wales reported by Craig, Francis, Bailey, and Robbins (2003), and Francis, Robbins, Williams, and Williams (2007), and studies in Australia reported by Robbins and Francis (2011). Alongside the temperament profile of professional mobile clergy serving in the Church of England, table 1 also presents the relative prevalence of the four temperaments within Church of England congregations as provided by Francis, Duncan, Craig, and Luffman (2004), and by Francis, Robbins, and Craig (in press). These data demonstrate that the most frequently occurring psychological temperament among churchgoers is the Epimethean Temperament (SJ), accounting for between 55% and 73% of male and female churchgoers in the two studies. Among churchgoers the Apollonian Temperament (NF) is less prominent, accounting for between 10% and 21% of male and female churchgoers in the two studies.

Francis and Holmes (in press) is the first study to have provided information on the

psychological temperament of OLMs by reporting on data provided by 39 OLMs serving in one diocese of the Church of England (17 clergymen and 22 clergywomen). The findings from this study (summarised in table 1) found almost twice as many SJs (56%) as NFs (31%). The significance of the study is, however, limited by the small number of participants and by the focus on just one diocese. In a second study, Francis, Robbins, and Jones (in press) reported on data provided by 144 clergywomen ordained as OLMs throughout the Church of England. The findings from this study (also summarised in table 1) found well over twice as many SJs (65%) as NFs (24%). The significance of this study is, however, limited by the focus just on women.

Research question

Against this background, the aim of the present study is to test and to extend the findings of the two pioneering studies reported by Francis and Holmes (in press) and by Francis, Robbins, and Jones (in press) among a sample of male and female OLMs recruited from across the dioceses of the Church of England in which this form of ministry has been fostered. The primary hypothesis being tested by this study is that the psychological type profile and the psychological temperament profile of OLMs is significantly different from that of professional mobile clergy serving in the Church of England. This hypothesis will be tested by comparing the new data with the profiles of 626 clergymen and 237 clergywomen serving in the Church of England reported by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). The secondary hypothesis is that the profile of OLMs will be much closer to that of male and female churchgoers.

Method

Procedure

As part of a larger study reported by Village (2011) questionnaires were posted to all 2190 Anglican clergy ordained deacon between 2004 and 2007 in the United Kingdom, and

1061 were returned, making a response rate of 48%. The participants included 135 OLMs.

Instrument

Psychological type was assessed by the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS: Francis, 2005). This 40-item instrument comprises four sets of ten forced-choice items related to each of the four components of psychological type: orientation (extraversion or introversion), perceiving process (sensing or intuition), judging process (thinking or feeling), and attitude toward the outer world (judging or perceiving). Recent studies have demonstrated this instrument to function well in church-related contexts. For example, Francis, Craig, and Hall (2008) reported alpha coefficients of .83 for EI scale, .76 for the SN scale, .73 for the TF scale, and .79 for the JP scale.

Sample

Of the 135 participants, 10% were under the age of fifty, 37% were in their fifties, and 53% were in their sixties or older; 83% were married, 7% were single, 6% were divorced, and 4% were widowed; prior to ordination 23% had pursued education to O levels or GCSEs, 80% to A levels, 53% to degree or higher diploma, and 16% to postgraduate degree.

Analysis

The scientific literature concerned with psychological type (and by extension with psychological temperament) has developed a distinctive way of presented type-related data. The conventional format of 'type tables' has been used in the present paper to allow the findings from this study to be compared with other relevant studies in the literature. In the two type tables in this paper the profiles of male and female OLMs are compared with the profiles of professional mobile clergymen and clergywomen serving in the Church of England as reported by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). In these tables the statistical significances of differences in the profiles of different groups (namely OLMs and professional mobile clergy) is tested by the means of the Selection Ratio Index (I), an

extension of the classic chi-square test (Myers & McCaulley, 1985).

Results

The Francis Psychological Type Scales demonstrated satisfactory levels of internal consistency reliability among the OLMs generating the following Cronbach alpha coefficients (Cronbach, 1951): for the EI scale, .84; for the SN scale, .74; for the TF scale, .68; and for the JP scale, .74.

Clergymen

- Insert table 2 about here -

Table 2 presents the psychological type profile of the 56 clergymen serving in ordained local ministry and compares them with the psychological type profile of the 626 clergymen provided by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). These data will be discussed in two steps.

The first step discusses the psychological type profile of the clergymen serving in ordained local ministry. In terms of the dichotomous preferences, they display clear preferences for introversion (63%) over extraversion (38%), for sensing (64%) over intuition (36%), for feeling (77%) over thinking (23%) and for judging (79%) over perceiving (21%). In terms of dominant type preferences, they display the following hierarchy: dominant sensing (48%), dominant feeling (30%), dominant intuition (18%), and dominant thinking (4%). In terms of the sixteen complete types, the most frequently occurring types are ISFJ (30%), ESFJ (13%), and ISTJ (13%). In terms of psychological temperament preferences, the most frequently occurring temperament is SJ (57%), followed by NF (27%), NT (9%), and SP (7%).

The second step compares the psychological profiles of the two groups drawing on the data published by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). In terms of the dichotomous preferences there were no significant differences between the two groups on the

orientations or on the attitudes: 63% of the OLMs preferred introversion, and so did 57% of the other group; 79% of the OLMs preferred judging, and so did 68% of the other group. There were, however, significant differences between the two groups on the perceiving process and on the judging process: while 64% of the OLMs preferred sensing, the proportion fell to 38% among the other group, with the opposite trend in intuition (36% over 62% respectively); while 77% of the OLMs preferred feeling, the proportion fell to 54% among the other group.

In terms of dominant type preferences, there were similar proportion in the two groups of dominant feeling types (30% among OLMs and 28% among the other group) and of dominant intuitive types (18% among the OLMs and 29% among the other group). There were, however, significant differences between the two groups in the proportions of dominant sensing types (48% among the OLMs and 21% among the other group) and of dominant thinking types (4% among the OLMs and 22% among the other group).

In terms of the sixteen complete types, among the clergymen serving in ordained local ministry there is a significantly higher proportion of ISFJs (30% compared with 8%). There is also a significantly lower proportion of ENTJs (0% compared with 8%).

In terms of psychological temperament, the SJ temperament is significantly higher among clergymen serving in ordained local ministry (57% compared with 31%) and the NT temperament is significantly lower among clergymen serving in ordained local ministry (9% compared with 27%). There are, however, no significant differences between the proportions of NFs (27% among OLMs and 35% among the other group) and for SPs (7% among OLMs and 7% among the other group).

Clergywomen

- Insert table 3 about here -

Table 3 presents the psychological type profile of the 79 clergywomen serving in ordained

local ministry and compares them with the psychological type profile of the 237 clergywomen provided by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). These data will be discussed in the same way as the foregoing data on clergymen.

The first step discusses the psychological type profile of the clergywomen serving in ordained local ministry. In terms of the dichotomous preferences, they display clear preferences for introversion (62%) over extraversion (38%), for sensing (58%) over intuition (42%), for feeling (75%) over thinking (25%), and for judging (85%) over perceiving (15%). In terms of dominant type preferences, they display the following hierarchy: dominant sensing (38%), dominant intuition (29%), dominant feeling (24%), and dominant thinking (9%). In terms of the sixteen complete types, the most frequently occurring types are ISFJ (25%), INFJ (17%), and ESFJ (17%). In terms of psychological temperament preferences, the most frequently occurring temperament is SJ (54%), followed by NF (29%), NT (13%) and SP (4%).

The second step compares the psychological profiles of the two groups drawing on the data published by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). In terms of the dichotomous preferences, there were no significant differences between the two groups on the orientations or on the judging process: 62% of the OLMs preferred introversion, and so did 54% of the other group; 75% of the OLMs preferred feeling, and so did 74% of the other group. There were, however, significant differences between the two groups on the perceiving process and on the attitudes: while 58% of the OLMs preferred sensing, the proportion fell to 35% among the other group, with the opposite trend in intuition (42% compared with 65%); while 85% of the OLMs preferred judging, the proportion fell to 65% among the other group.

In terms of dominant type preferences, there were similar proportions in the two groups of dominant intuitive types (29% among the OLMs and 31% among the other group)

and of dominant thinking types (9% among the OLMs and 11% among the other group). There were, however, significant differences between the two groups in the proportions of dominant sensing types (38% among the OLMs and 19% among the other group) and of dominant feeling types (24% among the OLMs and 39% among the other group).

In terms of the sixteen complete types, among the clergywomen serving in ordained local ministry there are significantly higher proportions of ISFJs (25% compared with 12%) and of ESFJs (17% compared with 7%). There are also significantly lower proportions of ENFJs (4% compared with 15%) and of INFPs (4% compared with 14%).

In terms of psychological temperament, the SJ temperament is significantly higher among clergywomen serving in ordained local ministry (54% compared with 29%) and the NF temperament is significantly lower among clergywomen serving in ordained local ministry (29% compared with 50%). There are, however, no significant differences between the proportions of NTs (13% among OLMs and 15% among the others) and of SPs (4% among OLMs and 6% among the others).

Discussion and conclusion

The pioneers of ordained local ministry, like Ted Roberts (1972, 2006) have argued that this form of ministry has the potential to recruit a very different kind of priest who is rooted in the local congregation, grounded in the local community, and capable of proclaiming the gospel in contexts less accessible to the seminary trained, stipendiary and mobile professional clergy. The present study drew on psychological type theory and psychological temperament theory to examine whether OLMs do in fact project a different psychological profile from that projected by other clergy and whether this profile may be closer to the profile of church congregations.

The ground was set for the present study by three earlier studies reported among other clergy serving in the Church of England (Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007;

Francis, Robbins, Duncan, & Whinney, 2010; Francis, Robbins, & Whinney, 2011), by two earlier studies reported among Church of England congregations (Francis, Duncan, Craig, & Luffman, 2004; Francis, Robbins, & Craig, in press), and by two pioneering studies among OLMs (Francis & Holmes, in press; Francis, Robbins, & Jones, in press). This new study (among 79 female OLMs and 56 male OLMs) and the two earlier studies (among 39 male and female OLMs and 144 female OLMs) provide a consistent portrait of OLMs being significantly different from other clergy serving in the Church of England, and being closer in psychological temperament to the predominant profile of Church of England churchgoers.

The studies conducted among church congregations demonstrate the predominance of the Epimethean Temperament (SJ), accounting for between 55% and 73% of Church of England churchgoers. By way of contrast, the studies conducted among professional mobile clergy serving in the Church of England find the Epimethean Temperament falls to between 27% and 33%. Among OLMs, the Epimethean Temperament stands between 54% and 65% across the four samples reported.

Oswald and Kroeger's (1988) characterisation of the Epimethean Temperament as producing 'the conserving, serving pastor' provides helpful insight into how such clergy may lead their congregations. Congregations managed by SJ pastors will not go through unnecessary change, and when changes are initiated they will be implemented by evolution rather than by revolution. SJ clergy will work hard to foster a sense of loyalty and belonging in their congregations. They will prioritise a sense of social, moral and spiritual obligation throughout the congregation. They will work hard to develop sound plans, clear procedures, and precise policies, and encourage others to adhere to them. SJ clergy tend to bring good skills to administrative functions but find dealing with people more problematic. SJ clergy tend to take pastoral ministry very seriously and to want to approach pastoral ministry in a highly organised and practical way. They are realists who like a common-sense approach to

pastoral counselling and to problem solving. For SJ clergy, worship will be formal, generally dignified, and always predictable. This style of leadership may seem to make such good sense to church congregations that are also shaped by the SJ preferences.

The studies among church congregations demonstrate that the Apollonian Temperament (NF) is much less in evidence, accounting for between 10% and 21% of Church of England churchgoers. By way of contrast, the studies conducted among conventional clergy serving in the Church of England find the Apollonian Temperament the most frequently occurring temperament, accounting for between 35% and 50% of the clergy. Among OLMs, the Apollonian Temperament stands between 24% and 31% across the four samples reported.

Oswald and Kroeger's (1988) characterisation of the Apollonian Temperament as producing 'the authenticity-seeking, relationship-oriented pastor' provides helpful insight into how such clergy may offer a very different vision of ministry from that offered by the SJ pastor. NF clergy are more likely to be inspired by their vision for the future and by their plans and hopes for change and development. They are less likely to be constrained by (or indeed aware of) practical considerations. NF clergy tend to be high on inspiration, but lower on the practical down-to-earth aspects of ministry. This style of leadership may seem to make less good sense to church congregations that are shaped by the SJ preferences.

Two areas of practical importance and pastoral application are suggested from these findings employing psychological temperament theory. The first area concerns resourcing and developing OLMs shaped by the Epimethean Temperament (SJs). The second area concerns facilitating and developing the relationship between OLMs and the mobile stipendiary clergy with whom they may be working in the same parish.

In terms of resourcing and developing OLMs shaped by the Epimethean Temperament, clues are provided by the way in which Oswald and Kroeger (1988) discuss

some of the potential difficulties faced by SJ pastors. Oswald and Kroeger speak of the tendency toward literalism and pessimism. For SJs, scripture may need to be interpreted with respect for the text, and they may find it difficult to accept more liberal and flexible approaches. For SJs, other people's visions and enthusiasms need to be subjected to stringent risk assessment, and they may be unaware of the damage that this can do to the commitment of those whose visions they sideline. SJs may become particularly vulnerable to burnout as a consequence of their commitment to rules, procedures and obligations. SJs may weary some members of their congregation by an apparent obsession with structure, order, and discipline. In turn of SJs may be irritated by church members who fail to appreciate the importance of structure, deadlines and procedures. SJs may find individuals who reject conventional church teaching and conventional church discipline hard to accept. Dioceses working with OLMs may wish to offer psychological temperament awareness training to help SJ pastors to celebrate their strengths and to deal effectively with the potential weaknesses and dangers associated within their temperament.

In terms of facilitating and developing the relationship between OLMs and the mobile stipendiary clergy with whom they may be working in the same parish, clues are provided by identifying the potential areas of conflict between the preferred approaches of the Epimethean Temperament and the Apollonian Temperament. As individuals who are more likely to share the predominant temperament of the congregation, the resident OLMs are more likely to appreciate the reluctance of Anglican congregations to seek change and innovation. Such OLMs may wish to nurture and to support commitment to the established preferences of their congregations. When new mobile stipendiary clergy are appointed to parishes to work alongside well-established OLMs, there may be inevitable points of conflict between the more visionary and innovative approach of the Apollonian (NF) incumbent and the more cautious and conserving approach of the Epimethean (SJ) resident OLM. Dioceses working

with OLMs may wish to offer psychological temperament awareness training to help OLMs and newly appointed incumbents to appreciate each others' preferred styles of ministry and to negotiate effective ways of working together in the light of greater awareness of each others' psychological temperaments.

The present study was based on the analysis of the psychological type and psychological temperament profiles of individuals ordained as OLMs between 2004 and 2007. In light of the ongoing debates and developments of this form of ordained ministry in the Church of England, there may be every value in replicating this study in order to monitor potential changes in the profiles of those being recruited into ordained local ministry.

References

- Bigelow, E. D., Fitzgerald, R., Busk, P., Girault, E., & Avis, J. (1988). Psychological characteristics of Catholic sisters: relationships between the MBTI and other measures. *Journal of Psychological Type, 14*, 32-36.
- Burton, L., Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2010). Psychological type profile of Methodist circuit minister in Britain: similarities with and differences from Anglican clergy. *Journal of Empirical Theology, 23*, 64-81.
- Cabral, G. (1984). Psychological types in a Catholic convent: applications to community living and congregational data. *Journal of Psychological Type, 8*, 16-22.
- Craig, C L., Duncan, B., & Francis, L.J. (2006). Psychological type preferences of Roman Catholic priests in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Beliefs and Values, 27*, 157-164.
- Craig, C. L., Francis, L. J., Bailey, J., & Robbins, M. (2003). Psychological types in Church in Wales congregations. *The Psychologist in Wales, 15*, 18-21.
- Craig, C., Francis, L.J., & Robbins, M. (2004). Psychological type and sex differences among church leaders in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Beliefs and Values, 25*, 3-13.
- Craig, C. L., Horsfall, T., & Francis, L. J. (2005). Psychological types of male missionary personnel training in England: A role for thinking type men? *Pastoral Psychology, 53*, 475-482.
- Delis-Bulhoes, V. (1990). Jungian psychological types and Christian belief in active church members. *Journal of Psychological Type, 20*, 25-33.
- Francis, L. J., Butler, A., Jones, S. H., & Craig, C. L. (2007). Type patterns among active members of the Anglican church: a perspective from England. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture, 10*, 435-443.
- Francis, L.J., Craig, C.L., & Butler, A. (2007). Psychological types of male evangelical Anglican seminarians in England. *Journal of Psychological Type, 67*, 11-17.

- Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., & Hall, G. (2008). Psychological type and attitude toward Celtic Christianity among committed churchgoers in the United Kingdom: An empirical study. *Journal of Contemporary Religion*, 23, 181-191.
- Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., Horsfall, T., & Ross, C. F. J. (2005). Psychological types of male and female evangelical lay church leaders in England, compared with United Kingdom population norms. *Fieldwork in Religion*, 1, 69-83.
- Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., Whinney, M., Tilley, D., & Slater, P. (2007). Psychological profiling of Anglican clergy in England: Employing Jungian typology to interpret diversity, strengths, and potential weaknesses in ministry. *International Journal of Practical Theology*, 11, 266-284.
- Francis, L. J., Duncan, B., Craig, C. L., & Luffman, G. (2004). Type patterns among Anglican congregations in England. *Journal of Adult Theological Education*, 1, 66-77.
- Francis, L. J., Gubb, S., & Robbins, M. (2009). Psychological type profile of Lead Elders within the Newfrontiers network of churches in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 30, 61-69.
- Francis, L. J., Hancocks, G., Swift, C., & Robbins, M. (2009). Distinctive call, distinctive profile: The psychological type profile of Church of England full-time hospital chaplains. *Practical Theology* 2, 269-284.
- Francis, L. J., & Holmes, P. (in press). Ordained Local Ministers: The same Anglican orders, but different psychological temperaments?
- Francis, L. J., Littler, K., & Robbins, M. (2010). Psychological type and Offa's Dyke: Exploring differences in the psychological type profile of Anglican clergy serving in England and Wales. *Contemporary Wales*, 23, 240-251.

Francis, L. J., Nash, P., Nash, S., & Craig, C.L. (2007). Psychology and youth ministry:

Psychological type preferences of Christian youth workers in the United Kingdom.

Journal of Youth Ministry, 5(2), 73-90.

Francis, L. J., & Payne, V. J. (2002). The Payne Index of Ministry Styles (PIMS): Ministry

styles and psychological type among male Anglican clergy in Wales. *Research in the*

Social Scientific Study of Religion, 13, 125-141.

Francis, L. J., Payne, V. J., & Jones, S. H. (2001). Psychological types of male Anglican

clergy in Wales. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 56, 19-23.

Francis, L. J., Penson, A.W., & Jones, S.H. (2001). Psychological types of male and female

Bible College students in England. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 4, 23-32.

Francis, L. J. & Robbins, M. (2002). Psychological types of male evangelical church leaders.

Journal of Belief and Values, 23, 217-220.

Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Craig, C. L. (in press). The psychological type profile of

Anglican churchgoers in England: Compatible or incompatible with their clergy?

International Journal of Practical Theology.

Francis, L.J. Robbins, M., Duncan, B., & Whinney, M. (2010). Confirming the psychological

type profile of Anglican clergymen in England: A ministry for intuitives. In B. Ruelas

and V. Brisero (Eds.), *Psychology of Intuition* (pp. 211-219). New York: Nova

Science.

Francis, L.J., Robbins, M., & Jones, S. H. (in press). The psychological type profile of

clergywomen in ordained local ministry in the Church of England: pioneers or

custodians?

Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Whinney, M. (2011). Women priests in the Church of England:

Psychological type profile. *Religions*.

- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., Williams, A., & Williams, R. (2007). All types are called, but some are more likely to respond: The psychological profile of rural Anglican churchgoers in Wales. *Rural Theology*, 5, 23-30.
- Francis, L. J., Whinney, M., Burton, L., & Robbins, M. (2011). Psychological type preferences of male and female Free Church Ministers in England. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 22, 251-263.
- Gerhardt, R. (1983). Liberal religion and personality type. *Research in Psychological Type*, 6, 47-53.
- Greenfield, M. (1969). Typologies of persisting and non-persisting Jewish clergymen. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 16, 368-372.
- Harbaugh, G. L. (1984). The person in ministry: Psychological type and the seminary. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 8, 23-32.
- Holsworth, T. E. (1984). Type preferences among Roman Catholic seminarians. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 8, 33-35.
- Irvine, A. R. (1989). *Isolation and the parish ministry*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of St Andrews.
- Jones, S. H., Village, A., & Francis, L. J. (in press). Assessing the impact of Ordained Local Ministry on the performance of Church of England dioceses, 1991-2003. *Practical Theology*.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works, volume 6*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kay, W. K., & Francis, L. J. (2008). Psychological type preferences of female Bible College students in England. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 29, 101-105.

- Kay, W. K., Francis, L. J., & Craig, C. L. (2008). Psychological type preferences of male British Assemblies of God Bible College students: Tough minded or tender hearted? *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association*, 28, 6-20.
- Keirsey, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me*. Del Mar, California: Prometheus Nemesis.
- Macdaid, G. P., McCaulley, M. H., & Kainz, R.I. (1986). *Myers-Briggs type indicator: Atlas of type tables*. Gainesville, Florida: Centre for Application of Psychological Type Inc.
- Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Oswald, R. M., & Kroeger, O. (1988). *Personality type and religious leadership*. Washington, DC: The Alban Institute.
- Rehak, M.C. (1998). Identifying the congregation's corporate personality. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 44, 39-44.
- Roberts, T. (1972). *Partners and Ministers*. London: Falcon Books.
- Roberts T. (2006) A novelty, or back to basics? The Bethnal Green and Bermondsey experiments. In M. Torry, & J. Heskins (Eds.), *Ordained Local Ministry: A new shape for ministry in the Church of England* (pp. 11-17). Norwich: Canterbury Press.
- Robbins, M., & Francis, L. J. (2011). All are called, but some psychological types are more likely to respond: Profiling churchgoers in Australia. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 22, 213-229.
- Ross, C. F. J. (1993). Type patterns among active members of the Anglican church: comparisons with Catholics, Evangelicals and clergy. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 26, 28-35.

Ross, C. F. J. (1995). Type patterns among Catholics: four Anglophone congregations compared with Protestants, Francophone Catholics and priests. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 33, 33-41.

Village, A., (2011). Gifts differing? Psychological type among stipendiary and non-stipendiary clergy. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 22, 230-250.

Table 1

Psychological temperament profiles for Church of England clergy and churchgoers

| | N | NT % | NF % | SJ % | SP % |
|----------------------------|------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| <u>Professional clergy</u> | | | | | |
| clergymen ¹ | 626 | 27 | 35 | 31 | 7 |
| clergymen ² | 622 | 28 | 39 | 27 | 6 |
| clergywomen ¹ | 237 | 15 | 50 | 29 | 6 |
| clergywomen ³ | 83 | 11 | 49 | 33 | 7 |
| <u>Churchgoers</u> | | | | | |
| men ⁴ | 116 | 13 | 19 | 56 | 12 |
| men ⁵ | 1169 | 13 | 10 | 71 | 7 |
| women ⁴ | 211 | 4 | 21 | 55 | 20 |
| women ⁵ | 2135 | 6 | 13 | 73 | 9 |
| <u>OLMs</u> | | | | | |
| clergymen ⁶ | 144 | 6 | 24 | 65 | 5 |
| clergywomen ⁷ | 39 | 5 | 31 | 56 | 8 |

Note ¹ from Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007)² from Francis, Robbins, Duncan, and Whinney (2010)³ from Francis, Robbins, and Whinney (2011)⁴ from Francis, Duncan, Craig, and Luffman (2004)⁵ from Francis, Robbins, and Craig (in press)⁶ from Francis, Robbins, and Jones (in press)⁷ from Francis and Holmes (in press)

Table 2

Type distribution for clergymen serving in ordained local ministry compared with clergymen serving in other ministries in the Church of England

| The Sixteen Complete Types | | | | Dichotomous Preferences | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|----------------|----------|------|--------------|
| ISTJ <i>n</i> = 7 (12.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.26 +++++ | ISFJ <i>n</i> = 17 (30.4%) <i>I</i> = 3.88*** +++++ | INFJ <i>n</i> = 3 (5.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.59 +++++ | INTJ <i>n</i> = 3 (5.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.49 +++++ | E <i>n</i> = 21 (37.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.87 | I <i>n</i> = 35 (62.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.10 | S <i>n</i> = 36 (64.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.68*** | N <i>n</i> = 20 (35.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.58*** | | | | |
| +++++ | +++++ | | | T <i>n</i> = 13 (23.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.50*** | F <i>n</i> = 43 (76.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.43*** | | | | | | |
| +++++ | +++++ | | | J <i>n</i> = 44 (78.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.15 | P <i>n</i> = 12 (21.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.67 | | | | | | |
| +++ | +++++ | | | Pairs and Temperaments | | | | | | | |
| | | | | IJ <i>n</i> = 30 (53.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.42* | IP <i>n</i> = 5 (8.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.47 | EP <i>n</i> = 7 (12.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.98 | EJ <i>n</i> = 14 (25.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.82 | | | | |
| ISTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.0 | ISFP <i>n</i> = 1 (1.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.24 ++ | INFP <i>n</i> = 3 (5.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.53 +++++ | INTP <i>n</i> = 1 (1.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.34 ++ | ST <i>n</i> = 8 (14.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.72 | SF <i>n</i> = 28 (50.0%) <i>I</i> = 2.70*** | NF <i>n</i> = 15 (26.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.77 | NT <i>n</i> = 5 (8.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.33** | | | | |
| ESTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.0 | ESFP <i>n</i> = 3 (5.4%) <i>I</i> = 2.24 +++++ | ENFP <i>n</i> = 3 (5.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.80 +++++ | ENTP <i>n</i> = 1 (1.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.70 ++ | SJ <i>n</i> = 32 (57.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.83*** | SP <i>n</i> = 4 (7.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.99 | NP <i>n</i> = 8 (14.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.58 | NJ <i>n</i> = 12 (21.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.58* | | | | |
| | | | | TJ <i>n</i> = 11 (19.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.56* | TP <i>n</i> = 2 (3.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.32 | FP <i>n</i> = 10 (17.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.87 | FJ <i>n</i> = 33 (58.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.79*** | | | | |
| ESTJ <i>n</i> = 1 (1.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.27 ++ | ESFJ <i>n</i> = 7 (12.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.82 +++++ | ENFJ <i>n</i> = 6 (10.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.18 +++++ | ENTJ <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.0* | IN <i>n</i> = 10 (17.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.50** | EN <i>n</i> = 10 (17.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.68 | IS <i>n</i> = 25 (44.6%) <i>I</i> = 2.09*** | ES <i>n</i> = 11 (19.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.16 | | | | |
| | +++++ | | | ET <i>n</i> = 2 (3.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.20** | EF <i>n</i> = 19 (33.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.35 | IF <i>n</i> = 24 (42.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.51* | IT <i>n</i> = 11 (19.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.69 | | | | |
| | +++++ | | | | | | | | | | |
| | +++ | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jungian Types (E) | | | | Jungian Types (I) | | | | Dominant Types | | | |
| | <i>n</i> | % | <i>Index</i> | | <i>n</i> | % | <i>Index</i> | | <i>n</i> | % | <i>Index</i> |
| E-TJ | 1 | 1.8 | 0.12** | I-TP | 1 | 1.8 | 0.24 | Dt.T | 2 | 3.6 | 0.16*** |
| E-FJ | 13 | 23.2 | 1.45 | I-FP | 4 | 7.1 | 0.62 | Dt.F | 17 | 30.4 | 1.10 |
| ES-P | 3 | 5.4 | 1.52 | IS-J | 24 | 42.9 | 2.42*** | Dt.S | 27 | 48.2 | 2.27*** |
| EN-P | 4 | 7.1 | 0.77 | IN-J | 6 | 10.7 | 0.53 | Dt.N | 10 | 17.9 | 0.61 |

Note: N = 56

+ = 1% of N

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table 3

Type distribution for clergywomen serving in ordained local ministry compared with clergywomen serving in other ministries in the Church of England

| The Sixteen Complete Types | | | | Dichotomous Preferences | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|----------------|----------|------|--------------|
| ISTJ <i>n</i> = 7 (8.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.91 +++++ | ISFJ <i>n</i> = 20 (25.3%) <i>I</i> = 2.07** +++++ | INFJ <i>n</i> = 13 (16.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.56 +++++ | INTJ <i>n</i> = 5 (6.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.94 +++++ | E <i>n</i> = 30 (38.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.83 | I <i>n</i> = 49 (62.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.15 | S <i>n</i> = 46 (58.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.64*** | N <i>n</i> = 33 (41.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.65*** | | | | |
| | +++++ | +++++ | + | T <i>n</i> = 20 (25.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.97 | F <i>n</i> = 59 (74.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.01 | J <i>n</i> = 67 (84.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.31*** | P <i>n</i> = 12 (15.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.43*** | | | | |
| ISTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.0 | ISFP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.0 | INFP <i>n</i> = 3 (3.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.27* +++ | INTP <i>n</i> = 1 (1.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.75 + | Pairs and Temperaments | | | | | | | |
| | | | | IJ <i>n</i> = 45 (57.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.67*** | IP <i>n</i> = 4 (5.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.26** | EP <i>n</i> = 8 (10.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.65 | EJ <i>n</i> = 22 (27.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.92 | | | | |
| | | | | ST <i>n</i> = 10 (12.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.11 | SF <i>n</i> = 36 (45.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.89*** | NF <i>n</i> = 23 (29.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.58*** | NT <i>n</i> = 10 (12.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.86 | | | | |
| ESTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.0 | ESFP <i>n</i> = 3 (3.8%) <i>I</i> = 2.25 ++++ | ENFP <i>n</i> = 4 (5.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.48 +++++ | ENTP <i>n</i> = 1 (1.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.43 + | SJ <i>n</i> = 43 (54.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.87*** | SP <i>n</i> = 3 (3.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.60 | NP <i>n</i> = 9 (11.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.39** | NJ <i>n</i> = 24 (30.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.86 | | | | |
| ESTJ <i>n</i> = 3 (3.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.69 ++++ | ESFJ <i>n</i> = 13 (16.5%) <i>I</i> = 2.44** +++++ | ENFJ <i>n</i> = 3 (3.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.26** +++++ | ENTJ <i>n</i> = 3 (3.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.13 ++++ | TJ <i>n</i> = 18 (22.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.13 | TP <i>n</i> = 2 (2.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.43 | FP <i>n</i> = 10 (12.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.43** | FJ <i>n</i> = 49 (62.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.40** | | | | |
| | +++++ | +++++ | | IN <i>n</i> = 22 (27.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.85 | EN <i>n</i> = 11 (13.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.44** | IS <i>n</i> = 27 (34.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.62* | ES <i>n</i> = 19 (24.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.68* | | | | |
| | +++++ | +++++ | | ET <i>n</i> = 7 (8.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.72 | EF <i>n</i> = 23 (29.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.86 | IF <i>n</i> = 36 (45.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.14 | IT <i>n</i> = 13 (16.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.18 | | | | |
| | ++ | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jungian Types (E) | | | | Jungian Types (I) | | | | Dominant Types | | | |
| | <i>n</i> | % | <i>Index</i> | | <i>n</i> | % | <i>Index</i> | | <i>n</i> | % | <i>Index</i> |
| E-TJ | 6 | 7.6 | 0.86 | I-TP | 1 | 1.3 | 0.50 | Dt.T | 7 | 8.9 | 0.78 |
| E-FJ | 16 | 20.3 | 0.94 | I-FP | 3 | 3.8 | 0.22** | Dt.F | 19 | 24.1 | 0.62* |
| ES-P | 3 | 3.8 | 1.80 | IS-J | 27 | 34.2 | 2.03*** | Dt.S | 30 | 38.0 | 2.00*** |
| EN-P | 5 | 6.3 | 0.47 | IN-J | 18 | 22.8 | 1.32 | Dt.N | 23 | 29.1 | 0.95 |

Note: N = 79

+ = 1% of N

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$